Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/821,082	POLAN, MICHAEL G.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	JOSEPH L. GREENE	2151		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 01 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(fextensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). On which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original.	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate analy set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a capable. (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims.	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will	•	_	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments are not persuasive with respect to the claimed subject matter. With respect to the applicant's arguments towards the prior-art, it is stated that they are different, with respect to claim 1, in that the applicant's system is a centrally controlled system of grid computing and that verbeke's system is a peer-to-peer network. However, claim 1, does not claim a centrally controlled system. Rather, it claims a manager for a grid computing system. However, the system described in Verbeke, by definition, is a manager that is controlling a grid of networked computers. Furthermore, a peer-ro-peer network does not necessarily have to be distributedly controlled. Further responses to arguments can be seen in a similar light as the claimed subject matter remains broad to such a degree, that it is not patentably distinguishible over the prior-art.